REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, and 10 are objected to for alleged minor informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's allegations that the drawing figures fail to show a case when n and m are equal to 2. For example, as clearly shown in FIG. 6, the gate lines GL are shown in order GL1, GL2, GL3,...GLm-2, GLm-1, and GLm. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the state of n=m=2 is shown in FIG. 6 when GLm-2 =GL0, GLm-1=GL1, and GLm=GL2. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the objection to claims 1, 5, and 10 are unfounded since at least FIG. 6 clearly provides adequate support of the state of n=m=2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1, 5, and 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyahara et al. (US 6,075,507) in view of Asada et al. (US 5,867,141), and Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action admits that "Miyahara does not expressly teach conducting the data supply channel and conducting the data-supplying channel are performed simultaneously." Thus, the Office Action relies upon Asada et al. for allegedly teaching "a driving method for liquid crystal display wherein the data supply channel and data-supplying channel are performed simultanously (col. 13, lines 31-38)." As a result, the Office Action concludes that "[i]t would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Asada for simultaneously applying data to be incorporated to Miyahara's device so as motivated by Asada, to be able to permit a competent

image quality to be secured with a stable high contrast (col. 3, lines 62-65)." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that Asada et al. fails to provide proper motivation with which to modify Miyahara et al. since Asada et al. fails to teach or suggest the desirability of simultaneously "conducting the first data supplying channel and conducting the second data supplying channel." The specific passage cited by the Office Action of Asada et al. clearly fails to support the Office Action's allegation that "the data supply channel and data-supplying channel are performed simultanously." Claim 6 of Asada et al. provides no motivation whatsoever to modify Miyahara et al. "to be able to permit a competent image quality to be secured with a stable high contrast." Asada et al. discloses (col. 3, lines 62-65) that a gate storage structure "having a high opening ratio" permits a competent image quality to be secured with a stable high contrast, and nothing with regards to simultaneously supplying data.

Furthermore, the Office Action alleges (see Response to Arguments #5) that "Asada made it clear that by simultaneously supplying data, high contrast will be achieved (col. 1, lines 65-67)." However, Asada et al. discloses *absolutely nothing* with regard to "high contrast" at col. 1, lines 65-67. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action again has completely failed to provide any proper motivation to modify Miyahara et al. to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention.

MPEP § 2143.01 instructs that "[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggest the desireability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir.

1990)." Accordingly, because the applied art is completely silent and does not suggest any desirability of the Office Action's alleged combination, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action has clearly not established any type of *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Regarding independent claims 5 and 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that Asada et al. fails to teach or suggest "a pre-charging controller continuously generating first and second gate start pulses such that data corresponding to an (n-2)th data line is supplied to an nth data line, wherein n is an integer greater than or equal to 2" and "applying the first and second gate start pulses to the gate driving integrated circuit." In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action's allegation that the claimed pre-charging controller is "fairly similar to the blanking period shown in figure 5 of Asada's device" and that "the claims are substantially similar to claims 5 and 7-9 respectively, and would be analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5 and 7-9 above" is simply not correct and wholly untrue. For example, the blanking period shown in FIG. 5 of Asada et al. fails to even begin to disclose "continuously generating first and second gate start pulses such that data corresponding to an (n-2)th data line is supplied to an nth data line, wherein n is an integer greater than or equal to 2," as recited by independent claims 5 and 10, and "applying the first and second gate start pulses to the gate driving integrated circuit," as recited by independent claim 5.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant again respectfully submits that claims 1-13 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS

By: _____
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: February 15, 2005

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000